REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-17 have been pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kihl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,536 B1) in view of Lomet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,086 B1).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kihl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,536 B1) in view Lomet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,086 B1) and Nakagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,911).

Claims are amended, cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice, and added. Thus, pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

Independent claims were 1, 14, 15, 16, and 17. Independent claims 1 (program product claim) and 17 (apparatus claim) have been cancelled, and new independent claim 18 (program product) including dependent claim 19 thereof, and new independent claim 20 (apparatus claim) including dependent claim 21 thereof have been added. Dependent claims 2-6 are amended to depend from new dependent claim 19. Dependent claims 7, 9, and 12 are amended to depend from new claim 18.

Independent claims 14-16 are amended to require limitations similar to new independent claim 18.

In item 3 of the Office Action, the Office Action relied on Kihl as alleged teaching of the claimed steps (a)-(c) and on Lomet as alleged teaching of step (d). However, the Office Action does not expressly reject step (e), which read "sending the second client the retrieved log records of **past replies, together with the new pending inquiry** directed to the second client" (emphasis added). Further, the language of amended independent claims clarifies "when a subject of the pending inquiry corresponding to the first delivery request is similar to a subject of a past inquiry, retrieving from the log memory a log record corresponding to the past inquiry, and sending to the first client the retrieved log record corresponding to the past inquiry together with the pending inquiry corresponding to the first delivery request."

Kihl discusses a relay server system 12 between subscriber terminals and a plurality of bank systems (FIG. 1). The Office Action acknowledges Kihl does not discuss the claimed retrieving and sending of log records. So the Office Action relies upon Lomet FIGs. 3-4 and 7

8

and columns 5, 10, 11 as indicated. However, Lomet generally, including relied upon FIGS. 3 and 7 and column 5, lines 9-54 and column 10, lines 42-50 and column 11, lines 56-67, discusses a server logging its replies to the client as part of a recovering scheme when the client is recovering. So in Lomet, when a client is restarted, the client regenerates requests from the client's logged operations and resubmits them to the server during replay, and then the server recovers the corresponding reply from the server's reply log. In contrast, the language of independent claims provide that "when a subject of the pending inquiry corresponding to the first delivery request is similar to a subject of a past inquiry, *retrieving from the log memory a log record corresponding to the past inquiry*, and *sending* to the first client the retrieved *log record corresponding to the past inquiry together with the pending inquiry* corresponding to the first delivery request," which provides a benefit of allowing an operator of the client to consult records of past replies for replying to the pending inquiry. In other words, the sent log record is not a reply to the pending inquiry, while in Lomet the server returns a past reply as reply to a re-generated request from the client when the client is recovering.

A prima facie case of obviousness over Kihl and Lomet has not been established, because nothing has been found or cited, expressly or implicitly, that one skilled in the art would combine Lomet's reply logging by a server as part of a recovery scheme for the client to recover with Kihl's relay server, and then further modify Lomet's server that logs replies to client requests to provide the claimed "when a subject of the pending inquiry corresponding to the first delivery request is similar to a subject of a past inquiry, ... *sending ... the retrieved log record corresponding to the past inquiry together with the pending inquiry* corresponding to the first delivery request," and seen a benefit of allowing an operator of the client to consult records of past replies for replying to the pending inquiry. In other words, the language of claims provides sending past inquiry logs as well as the pending inquiry to the client. For example, the present application page 13, lines 19-26 supports the claims.

New dependent claims 19 and 21 are allowable by reciting the terms "second client" and "second delivery request" for requesting a log record, namely "in response to a second delivery request from a second client to deliver log records to the second client, retrieving log records from the log memory, and sending the retrieved log records to the second client on the network." Nothing has been found or cited in Kihl or Lomet that discusses delivering log records to a second client.

9

Withdrawal of the rejections and Allowance of the claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: September 22, 2008   By: _____
                                       Mehdi D. Sheikerz
                                       Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501